



**NAPERVILLE PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION
MINUTES OF APRIL 6, 2016**

**UNOFFICIAL PRIOR TO PZC APPROVAL
APPROVED BY THE PZC ON APRIL 20, 2016**

Call to Order

7:05 p.m.

A. Roll Call

Present: Crawford, Hansen, Hastings, Martinez, Messer, Peterson, Williams
Hajek arrived at 8:01 p.m.
Absent: Bansal
Student Members: None
Staff Present: Planning Team – Allison Laff, Trevor Dick, Sara Kopinski, Erin Venard
Engineering Team – Peter Zibble

B. Minutes

Approve the minutes of the March 16, 2016 Planning and Zoning Commission meeting.

Motion: Williams
Second by: Hastings

Approved
(7 to 0)

C. Old Business

D. Public Hearings

**D1.
PZC 15-1-120
606 S. Main Street
Variance**

The petitioner requests approval of variances to Section 6-6C-7:1 (R2 District, Yard Requirements) to reduce the required front and corner side yards on the subject property in order to construct a single-family residence and associated detached garage at the subject property located at 606 S. Main Street.

Erin Venard, Planning Services Team, gave an overview of the request.

Laurie Bollnow, spoke as the petitioner:

- Ms. Bollnow has owned the property for 15 years and hopes to build her dream home there.

The Planning and Zoning Commission did not have any questions for the petitioner.

Public Testimony: none

Planning and Zoning Commission closed the public hearing.

Planning and Zoning Commission moved to recommend approval of PZC 15-1-120, variances to Section 6-6C-7:1 (R2 District, Yard Requirements) to reduce the required front and corner side yards on the subject property in order to construct a single-family residence and associated detached garage at the subject property located at 606 S. Main Street.

Motion by: Williams
Seconded by: Hastings

Approved
(7 to 0)

Ayes: Crawford, Hansen, Hastings, Martinez, Messer,
Peterson, Williams

Nays: None

Absent: Bansal, Hajek

**D2.
PZC 16-1-010
1652 White Pines
Court Variance**

The petitioner requests approval of a variance to Section 6-2-3 (Yard Requirements) of the Naperville Municipal Code to permit a generator in the required front yard at the subject property located at 1652 White Pines Court.

Erin Venard, Planning Services Team, gave an overview of the request.

David Moeser, spoke as the petitioner noting that he is available to answer any questions from the Commission.

Planning and Zoning Commission inquired about:

- Messer – what additional landscaping is the petitioner proposing to meet staff's conditions? Petitioner indicated that he will plant any landscaping materials that will adequately hide the unit.

Public Testimony: none

Planning and Zoning Commission closed the public hearing.

Planning and Zoning Commission moved to recommend approval of PZC 16-1-010, a variance to Section 6-2-3 (Yard Requirements) of the Naperville Municipal Code to permit a generator in the required front yard at the subject property located at 1652 White Pines Court.

Motion by: Williams
Seconded by: Messer

Approved
(7 to 0)

Ayes: Crawford, Hansen, Hastings, Martinez, Messer,
Peterson, Williams

Nays: None

Absent: Bansal, Hajek

**D3.
PZC 16-1-016
Harter Investments
Signage Variance**

The petitioner requests approval of a variance from Section 5-4-5:2 (Monument Signs) of the Naperville Municipal Code, to permit an existing monument sign to remain perpendicular to Washington Street for the property located at 600 N. Washington Street.

Sara Kopinski, Planning Services Team, gave an overview of the request.

Matt Goodman, Attorney, Rosanova and Whitaker, spoke on behalf of the petitioner and noted that he is available for questions from the Commission.

Planning and Zoning Commission did not have any questions for the petitioner.

Public Testimony: none

Planning and Zoning Commission closed the public hearing.

Planning and Zoning Commission moved to recommend approval of PZC 16-1-016, a variance from Section 5-4-5:2 (Monument Signs) of the Naperville Municipal Code, to permit an existing monument sign to remain perpendicular to Washington Street for the property located at 600 N. Washington Street.

Motion by: Williams
Seconded by: Peterson

Approved
(7 to 0)

Ayes: Crawford, Hansen, Hastings, Martinez, Messer,
Peterson, Williams

Nays: None

Absent: Bansal, Hajek

**D4.
PZC 16-1-023
Ootra Parking
Variance**

The petitioner requests approval of a variance from Section 6-9-3 (Schedule of Off-Street Parking Requirements) of the Municipal Code to reduce the number of required off-street parking spaces from 15 to 8 spaces at the property located at 303 N. Center Street.

Allison Laff, Deputy Director - Planning & Development, TED Business Group, gave an overview of the request.

Planning and Zoning Commission inquired about:

- Martinez – The petitioner has agreed to the conditions in the staff report?
Laff – Yes.

Steve Shiffler, spoke as the petitioner:

- Building has been in the family since 1940s.
- Concur with staff presentation.
- Cognizant of parking situation around the train station and selects the tenant mix with this in mind.

Planning and Zoning Commission inquired about:

- Hansen – frequented the shop in the past, wanted to confirm that the operations are changing and the shop is now appointment only. Shiffler – That is correct.

Public Testimony: none

Planning and Zoning Commission closed the public hearing.

Planning and Zoning Commission moved to recommend approval of PZC 16-1-023, a variance from Section 6-9-3 (Schedule of Off-Street Parking Requirements) of the Municipal Code to reduce the number of required off-street parking spaces from 15 to 8 spaces at the property located at 303 N. Center Street.

Motion by: Williams
Seconded by: Hastings

Approved
(7 to 0)

Ayes: Crawford, Hansen, Hastings, Martinez, Messer,
Peterson, Williams
Nays: None
Absent: Bansal, Hajek

**D5.
PZC 16-1-030
Schoene Variance**

The petitioners request approval of a variance from Section 6-9-2:4.2.3 (Off-Street Parking Facilities; Yard Requirements for Off-Street Parking Facilities) of the Naperville Municipal Code to permit a parking space within 5ft of the interior property line at the subject property located at 6 N. Wright St.

Erin Venard, Planning Services Team, gave an overview of the case.

Planning and Zoning Commission inquired about:

- Messer – Would like to hear more about why staff does not support the variance? Venard - Code requires 2 parking spaces. This is 1 space above and beyond what the code requires. Staff does not feel there is a hardship. Also, the property is in the Historic District and it is preferred that driveway curb cuts are off the corner side property line or alley.

Patti Bernard, Attorney with Dommermuth, Cobine, West, Gensler, Philipchuck, Corrigan and Bernard, spoke on behalf of the petitioner:

- Gave an overview of the request.
- Highlighted that parking is now along the north property line, on a single lane driveway.
- Reviewed the site plan which removes the existing asphalt driveway and garage in the front yard and adds a new asphalt driveway and garage in the corner side yard.
- Hardship is the lack of alley access and a utility vault, which limits the width of the new driveway.

- Petitioner is a 3 car family; do not wish to park on the street.
- The variance standards speak to the variance being in harmony with the intent and purpose of the district. Currently, the property is not in harmony because of the large asphalt driveway on the property line.
- The code requires 2 parking spaces, but it does not say 2 parking spaces is the maximum.
- Code requires a 9 foot wide parking space, in order to accommodate the proposed parking space extends approximately 1 foot into the required setback.
- Disagree with City staff and feels this proposal will be a better look for the area.

Planning and Zoning Commission inquired about:

- Hastings – To clarify, you are going from an asphalt driveway and garage which will convert to a parking space with curb cut on Wright. And you are building a new garage and driveway with a curb cut on Benton? Bernard – Yes.
- Martinez – Are the neighbors to the north comfortable with the change? Schoene – Yes, the neighbors are supportive.
- Peterson – Is any special engineering required for the apron? Does it need to be concrete? Bernard- The apron will be concrete and it will be pavers beyond sidewalk. Venard – Correct.
- Peterson – Does City require engineering on the pavers? Zibble –We would require that the construction detail include proper aggregate base.

Public Testimony: none

Planning and Zoning Commission closed the public hearing.

Planning and Zoning Commission Discussion:

- Messer – Is the PZC representative to the Historic Preservation Commission. The HPC did not review this item. Lives close to here, so is aware of challenges with corner lots. Reluctant yes on this. Hard to see the hardship.
- Hansen – Variance does not go to the HPC, but will the structure? Venard - Detached garages do not require Commission review.
- Crawford – Not hearing any dissent; think it is a borderline issue; tends to be supportive.
- Peterson – Agrees; hardship from the lack of alley access and the utility box. Supporting.
- Hansen – Shares Commissioners' concerns. Appreciates petitioner's efforts in proposing something unique but has concern that there is now 2 curb cuts on a corner lot where we are trying to mitigate curb cuts; supporting.
- Williams – Leaning towards a yes; sticking point is whether or not there is a hardship. Does think the lack of alley access is a hardship. The plan

presented is tasteful and does not impact or insult the historic district. Seriously commend staff on the negative recommendation in favor of protecting historic district. Will vote yes.

- Hastings – Will vote yes; however, if there was neighborhood dissent would vote no.
- Martinez – Supporting.

Planning and Zoning Commission moved to recommend approval of PZC 16-1-030, a variance from Section 6-9-2:4.2.3 (Off-Street Parking Facilities; Yard Requirements for Off-Street Parking Facilities) of the Naperville Municipal Code to permit a parking space within 5ft of the interior property line at the subject property located at 6 N. Wright St.

Motion by: Williams
Seconded by: Hastings

Approved
(7 to 0)

Ayes: Crawford, Hansen, Hastings, Martinez, Messer, Peterson, Williams
Nays: None
Absent: Bansal, Hajek

**D7.
PZC 16-1-032
Land Cash
Dedication
Ordinance**

The petitioner requests approval of amendments to Title 7 (Subdivision Regulations), Chapter 3 (Required Improvements), specifically related to Section 7-3-5: Dedication of park lands and school sites or for payments or fees in lieu of.

Trevor Dick, Development Manager, gave an overview of the request.

Public Testimony:

Karen Sullivan, Superintendent of Indian Prairie School District 204

- Indian Prairie District 204 is the 4th largest district in the State of Illinois.
- 31 of the 33 school buildings have been built since the 1972 Land Cash Dedication Ordinance.
- The District holds \$277 million in bonded debt and has pledged to use land cash dollars to pay down said debt.
- Any loss of revenue from the loss of the ordinance would place the debt burden back on tax payers.
- The District supports paying fees at time of building permit, updating the density formula, and waiving the fees for age-restricted developments.
- Finding that we gain significantly more students from apartments, townhouses, and condos than the tables predict.

Dan Bridges, Superintendent of Schools, Naperville Unit 203

- Since the inception of the 1972 Land Cash Dedication Ordinance, the District has grown from 6,000 students to 17,000 students.
- Land cash fees are an important part of the commitment to invest in

district facilities.

- Land cash monies have been spent on significant improvements to Naperville North and Naperville Central, as well as the construction of the Ann Reid Early Childhood Education Center, which was constructed on land received from a developer.
- Supports maintaining the ordinance; recognizing that the ordinance requires review.
- Supports amending the ordinance to delay payments until time of permit.
- Willing to discuss waiving fees for age-restricted developments.

Ray McGury, Park District

- Willing to work with City staff.
- Land cash money does not go to Park District operations. It is strictly for open spaces and improvement of land.
- Land cash monies have been used on the following projects: Nike Sports Complex expansion, Centennial Beach bathhouse renovation, and Ashwood Park Playground development.
- Send a positive recommendation to maintain the ordinance

Planning and Zoning Commission inquired about:

- Hansen – Are the generation tables we are using now created internally?
Laff – Existing table is from 2007 and was done by Ehlers and Associates. We have always contracted out for that information.

Planning and Zoning Commission closed the public hearing

Planning and Zoning Commission Discussion:

- Martinez – Ordinance is so important to the City. School districts and parks are very important to the City. Absolutely supporting.
- Hansen – Proud of the fact that Naperville was at the forefront in the 1970s. I applaud the Council and the staff for bringing this back now.
- Williams – Echo the thoughts of Commissioner Hansen.

Planning and Zoning Commission moved to recommend approval of PZC 16-1-032, amendments to Title 7 (Subdivision Regulations), Chapter 3 (Required Improvements), specifically related to Section 7-3-5: Dedication of park lands and school sites or for payments or fees in lieu of.

Motion by: Williams
Seconded by: Hastings

Approved
(8 to 0)

Ayes: Crawford, Hajek, Hansen, Hastings, Martinez, Messer,
Peterson, Williams
Nays: None
Absent: Bansal

**D6.
PZC 15-1-026
Bauer Place**

The petitioner requests approval of a rezoning to R3 (Medium Density Multiple-Family Residence District) upon annexation and a Preliminary/Final Subdivision Plat.

Len Monson, Attorney with Kuhn, Heap & Monson, spoke on behalf of the petitioner:

- Confident that the Planning and Zoning Commission wants to avoid the appearance of impropriety.
- Believes that Commissioner Peterson should recuse himself from the proceedings.
- It makes sense that a Commissioner should recuse himself if having a financial interest in the petition before him or if a Commissioner is unable to be fair and impartial.
- Regarding financial interest, in our private meetings with residents last June and July, Commissioner Peterson was very concerned with the petition and made it very clear that the proposed development would negatively impact the property values in the neighborhood.
- Commissioner Peterson lives in the neighborhood and thus has indicated he has a financial interest in the petition.
- Additionally, Commissioners should be fair and impartial. A Commissioner should not be an active participant for or against any petition outside of the Planning and Zoning Commission proceedings.
- Prior to his appointment to the Commission, Commissioner Peterson was a very active objector. He submitted an e-mail letter of objection and took a very strong leadership role in the private meetings with the developer. As an active Commissioner, he was active with the objectors by posting comments on their Facebook page.
- It is not his comments that are objectionable; it is that the comments were placed on an objector's Facebook page.
- My thought is that a Planning and Zoning Commissioner cannot be both an active objector and a Planning and Zoning Commissioner on the same petition.
- I respectfully request that Commissioner Peterson recuse himself and that my objection be entered into the record.
- Martinez – Commissioner Peterson, do you have anything to add to Counselor Monson's request?
- Peterson – No.
- Martinez – You will not be recusing yourself tonight?
- Peterson – That is correct. I was asked by several individuals, both on City staff and here on the Commission, if I would be recusing myself prior to coming tonight. I was active in the June meetings and did not attend the July meeting. I was contacted by the Mayor late in June regarding the appointment. He asked me to step aside from the communications at that time. I obliged that request. I did talk about recusing myself from the meeting back when I was appointed in July and it was a 30 unit proposal. I was not appointed at that time the project

returned in July. I have stayed out of meetings; have not communicated with Mr. Monson; have not sent an objectionable e-mail. It is my job and duty to look at the East Sector Plan and to look at the 5 reasons for rezoning and to make a judgement based upon that. I will do that based upon the merits of the proposal put before us tonight.

Allison Laff, Deputy Director, Planning & Development, TED Business Group, gave an overview of the request.

Planning and Zoning Commission inquired about:

- Hastings – Does staff recommend that Commissioner Peterson recuse himself? Laff – Based on our review of the Code, there would be no basis for a required recusal for Commissioner Peterson for this case.
- Williams – What has been done relative to a parking study? Laff – All the parking requirements are met in the proposal including required parking and visitor parking. There was a traffic study that was done based on the 24 unit proposal. It was reviewed by the Engineering Team and supported. It has not been updated because the 22 unit proposal would generate less impact.

Len Monson, Attorney with Kuhn, Heap & Monson, spoke on behalf of the petitioner:

- The subject property is located at the southwest corner of Bauer and Charles.
- Reviewed the surrounding property uses.
- The original plan was a 30 unit townhome development.
- Original concerns were density, impact of development on Bauer, lack of community amenities, and lack of space between the buildings.
- Pursuant to PZC direction, the plans were revised prior to City Council. Developers reviewed the e-mails sent from neighbors, which indicated a preference of 8 units per acre.
- Prior to spending additional money to revise the plans, the petitioner asked the Mayor to intervene.
- The Mayor indicated to proceed with 24 units and to keep the area near Bauer open.
- At the November 3 City Council meeting, the petitioner was surprised to receive strong opposition to the density.
- The petitioner again contacted the opposition, who stated that the primary concerns were density and height.
- Proposed 4 plan alternatives. Met with the developer's engineering team, staff, City Council and neighbors.
- As directed, the petitioner reduced the density to 7.37 dwelling units/acre, kept Bauer Road open, added a 4ft berm along Bauer Road, added a large buffer along Charles Ave., increased the distance between the buildings, added extensive landscaping, and added a site amenity of a large open fireplace feature.

- 2.5 story plan with an English basement; brick in excess of the city requirement.
- 35'6" height.

Planning and Zoning Commission inquired about:

- Hansen – Are all the buildings 2.5 stories? Monson – Yes.

Public Testimony:

Randy Bray

- An owner of the subject property.
- The southern two properties have been on the market since 2001 advertised as a single-family; not one offer has been received.
- Have had several developers look at the property.
- As an owner of the property, I believe Mr. Peterson should recuse himself. He has made statements that have incited people to attend the meeting.
- There is absolutely no evidence that says townhomes will reduce the value of property. If done right, they have just as good a chance of increasing the value of property.
- The project will not affect the health, safety, and welfare of the surrounding property.
- Developers have bent over backwards to appease the audience and the audience has lied to the developers. The audience does not want anything on this property.
- My family has done everything we can to sell the property as single-family. We believe that we are looking out for the neighbors' best interest.

Suyog Bhobe

- Lives at the corner of West Avenue and Bauer since December 2014.
- All the homes in the area are single-family; under the impression that it would remain that way.
- High density housing will bring down property values.

David Shang

- The plan revisions were made on incomplete judgment that the property was a transitional area.
- Poses a flood danger to my house.
- The developer uses my house to compare the height of the townhouses. The townhouses are 3ft higher.
- Requested an increased setback, a row of privacy trees, and a fence along my property line. The developer did not respond to the requests.
- Concerned with raising the grade on the property and how it will affect my property.
- Portions of the property do not fall within the Ogden Avenue Plan.
- The developer has not addressed the rezoning standards.

- Williams – Is engineering staff familiar with Mr. Shang’s concerns?
Zibble – Yes. The final design will need to meet the DuPage County storm water requirements. The preliminary design shows that there is adequate room set aside for detention. Final engineering will reveal exactly how much water will need to be detained. Establishment of final grade is a final engineering issue. We will ensure that water will not leave the property and travel to the surrounding properties.
- Williams – Will you support the project if the developer responds to the three issues you noted: the setback, the trees, and the fence? Shang – Yes.
- Martinez – From what I read, the project exceeds the landscaping requirements. Laff – They have exceeded Code. The west property line has perimeter trees, but they are not necessarily 100% privacy screening.
- Williams – I will ask Mr. Monson to respond to these concerns.

Mike Marek

- Reviewed the consistent issues of the project: traffic, rezoning, height, density, precedent, and rental restrictions.
- The City opposes a proposed storage facility at 75th Street and Wehrli Road due to the 75th Street Study; why does the Comprehensive Plan not matter here?
- There are 80 unincorporated acres to the west of the project; if we toss out the plan here, what are we following in the future?
- Neighbors never expressed a preference for a number of units. Residents always replied they need to see the number of units in the context of the plan.
- Reviewed the timeline of the project.
- Neighbors agreed to less than 18 units and 2 stories height.
- Discussed height of the buildings. The developer has piled dirt in front of the building to decrease the height.
- Williams – Is there merit to the contention that this is a device used to obscure the height? Zibble – We do not have enough information to make that judgement at this time.

Kevin Hynes

- Reviewed some of the townhouses in the area as shown by the petitioner. All are 2 story and face the street.
- We have been consistently asking for 2 story plan that does not look like barracks.
- These are the only 3 story buildings in the area.
- None of us have said the property has to be single-family. However, it has to be the right density.
- Reviewed Council feedback on the project from the November 3 meeting.

Bryan Chang

- Not against development; will continue to try to work with developers.
- Project still does not meet the municipal code and does not meet the Master Plan.
- Ignores the traffic impact and safety in the neighborhood.
- Dr. Kathy Sullivan stated the district has experienced a demographic shift that shows more students coming from townhouses than the tables show.
- Plan ignores the City Council direction and community input.

Kip Grossheusch

- Looked into buying the subject property; the reason it was not selling was the price.
- If you approve this, my intention is to sell my property to develop townhomes.

David Shang

- I submitted a detailed plan to the developer regarding my requests. If they make the changes I want and additionally revise the layout, I will support the plan.

Rob Koller

- My goal has been to make sure no townhomes end up on Bauer Road. I did sign off on this plan.
- I would ask you to think about 2 stories versus 3 stories.

Peggy Ko

- Thought the barracks style was ugly.
- Nothing entices people to move into the units away from the community areas.

Petitioner responded to the testimony:

- Our target market is empty nesters. It is not age-restricted.
- Density: Reduced the density from 30 to 22 units; 8 units per acre density was derived from the R3 zoning.
- Reviewed the density of multi-family/townhomes in the planning area. The proposed project has a lower density than all the other similar properties.
- Height: The proposed front elevation is 35'6". R3 allows a height of 43'. R1, R1A, and R1B allow a height of 35'. In the County, single-family is allowed a height of 36'.
- The rear elevation has an elevation of 39'6". The City has no restrictions on the height of the rear elevations.
- Reviewed the height of surrounding properties.
- A story is a design element. The plan is considered 2.5 stories because it has an English basement, which is needed to preserve the livability of the

property.

- The elevation at the curb on Bauer Road is between 762 and 767 and the elevation at the walkout basement is between 757 and 763. We are not piling dirt, we are making the property level.
- 2 City studies address this area: the Ogden Avenue Corridor Enhancement Initiative (“Ogden Avenue Plan”) and the East Sector Plan (ESP).
- The map in the ESP shows the property as low density, 2.5 units/acre. The ESP also provides that all parcels that have not been annexed should be analyzed to determine future land uses and that diversity in housing types should be promoted.
- The proposal provides a transition between low density housing and other intensive uses, as the ESP recommends.
- Reviewed the Ogden Avenue Plan and what has been approved in the residential areas.
- The area is transitional and the project meets the rezoning standards.
- Traffic: Bauer is a collector, then a neighbor collector. Pursuant to City standards, Bauer is an ample road for the size of the development.
- This development is under the threshold to provide a traffic study, but the developer provided one at the request of the neighbors.
- The traffic study states the development will have no significant impact on traffic.
- Storm water: The City of Naperville has one of the highest degrees of protection for storm water runoff. The development will be fully compliant.
- Reviewed the map from Mr. Shang. It does not match up with the Ogden Avenue Plan Study map.
- Have agreed to cap the rentals at 30% and will add that to the Covenants.
- Precedent: PZC does not create precedent. Additionally, the 80 acres referenced is not within the Ogden Avenue Planning area.
- Still share the opinion that there is no discernable difference between 24 and 22 units. But there is a difference between 30 and 22. There is also a difference in the height.
- Mr. Williams asked me to address Mr. Shang’s concerns. The setback is already 37ft feet. We are not inclined to increase the setback.
- Mr. Shang was adamant that we have done nothing to help him. However, we have reviewed his plan, added trees per his request and will add a fence as long as it does not impact engineering.
- We believe we have addressed the major concerns. I respectfully request your affirmative vote.
- Messer – You mentioned duplexes and townhomes in the immediate area. How many have walkout basements? Monson – I do not have that information. Our height is consistent with our neighbors.
- Messer – Mr. Shang had several statements and diagrams regarding storm water. Does your engineer have a response?
- Jim Caneff, Roake and Associates – I agree with the exhibit that shows

the drainage going to the midpoint of the lot line. Preliminary engineering is typically a schematic that shows what can be built and what can be built in a manner that will not impact the neighbors. I am confident that we can do this in a way that will not impact Mr. Shang's property. Typically the driveways should be on the collector road. We put the drives on Charles to control access on Bauer, which is a more heavily traveled roadway. The overland flow is 50 cubic feet per second. This number is from the County ordinance and is based on the upstream tributary flow. As we move to final engineering, all of that will be clearly defined.

- Peterson – Can you clarify if the units are walkout basements? The elevations do not show doors? Monson – There are only garage doors.
- Martinez – If we took the English windows out and put in siding, would it be considered a full story? Laff – Explained the datum point and the definition of story. If the English basement was 4 or more feet above the datum point, it would be counted as a full story. Also, Mr. Monson is correct in that height is only measured from the front elevation.

Planning and Zoning Commission closed the public hearing.

Planning and Zoning Commission Discussion:

- Williams – Voting for it. No question in my mind that this is a transitional area. Most important issue was density. I have never had an issue with water in any project. This is a world class community in dealing with water. Never set a precedent at the Planning and Zoning Commission. Each project is decided on a case by case basis.
- Hansen – Applaud and thank all of the audience for participating in the process. Different interpretations out there depending on what side you fall on. For me, it boils down to what makes sense. This is a transitional piece. In my mind, a townhouse use is appropriate. My previous concerns were with the density. I feel 22 units is a much more appropriate number. Supporting.
- Hastings – Agrees with Williams and Hansen. Supporting. Initially concerned with density. That concern has been alleviated. Appreciate the neighbors and their concerns. Also appreciate the current owner and their situation.
- Hajek – Agree with most of what has been said. Still see water as an issue but understand work will be done. Other item is traffic. Understand neighbors' concerns. Provided that the water issues and Mr. Shang's issues are addressed, I would be open to supporting.
- Peterson – The East Sector Plan is the governing doctrine for this property. The lots are clearly marked as low density. As Planning and Zoning Commissioners, we are asked to follow the guiding document. If we feel it is a transitional area, then we should revisit the guiding document. I do not feel a piecemeal redefinition of the plan is a good idea. Secondly, there are five zoning requirements that must be met and they have not been met. We recently reviewed an age-targeted

townhome development. It struck me that the Senior Task Force attending the meeting to support the project. I did not see a letter tonight supporting this development from the Senior Task Force. I did not see any letters from the neighbors or the school district with this project. Also, with the previous project, no one stood up to say it did not fit in their neighborhood. Common sense tells me when there is effort to drape or hide something, it does not fit in with the area. Will be voting no.

- Crawford – Thought the presentations and discussion was very comprehensive. All my questions were answered. Agrees with Commissioners Williams and Hansen. Will support.

Motion to extend the meeting to 11:15 p.m. (motion: Messer; 2nd: Williams) - unanimously approved.

- Messer – Commends Allison Laff on the comprehensive staff report. Echoes Commissioner Hansen’s comments on the residents’ involvement in the process. Sure the storm water issues will be resolved. Can debate if this is a transitional use. If that is the consensus, then the question is the degree of the transition. Would personally like the height to be 2 stories. Struggles with the conflicts between the studies. Sees Ogden Avenue Plan as a commercial study.
- Martinez – Enjoyed getting to know the residents on this project. Sees the parcel as a transitional use. The density issue was addressed. I do not think single-family homes will want to build on the subject property. Supporting.

Planning and Zoning Commission moved to recommend approval of PZC 15-1-026, a request for a rezoning to R3 (Medium Density Multiple-Family Residence District) upon annexation and a Preliminary/Final Subdivision Plat

Motion by: Williams
Seconded by: Hastings

Approved
(7 to 1)

Ayes: Crawford, Hajek, Hansen, Hastings, Martinez, Messer,
Williams

Nays: Peterson

Absent: Bansal

E. Reports and Recommendations

F. Correspondence

H. Adjournment

11:04 p.m.